C.L. Copy

FEBRUARY 1960

MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

THE STEEL STRIKE IN PERSPECTIVE

THE EDITORS

THE CONFLICT WITHIN PSYCHOANALYSIS

N. S. LEHRMAN

Alternatives to the Arms Race

W. H. FERRY

VOL. 11

10

EDITORS . . . LEO HUBERMAN . . . PAUL M. SWEEZY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS

VOLUME ELEVEN NUMBER TEN FEBRUARY 1960

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: The Steel Strike In Perspective 353
ALTERNATIVES TO THE ARMS RACE by W. H. Ferry 363
THE CONFLICT WITHIN PSYCHOANALYSIS: SCIENTIFIC SEARCH vs. MYSTERIOUS DOGMA by N. S. Lehrman 365
REFLECTIONS ON ALIENATION by Arthur K. Davis 371
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing 377

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly except July and August when bimonthly, and copyright, ©1960, by Monthly Review, Inc. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.

EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, New York.
Telephone: CHelsea 2-8403

MAILING ADDRESS: 66 Barrow Street, New York 14, New York.
Address ALL communications to 66 Barrow Street.

NEWSSTAND DISTRIBUTOR: B. De Boer, 102 Beverly Road, Bloomfield, N. J.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—$4; two years—$7.
By 1st class mail—United States $6; everywhere else $7.
By air mail—No. America $8; So. America $13; Europe $17; Asia $24.

EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

In reply to our letter of December 21 asking you to help make 1960 MR's Expansion Year, we received the following note from a reader in Tennessee:

> All my friends who are not hopelessly prejudiced are subscribers to MR. *They live outside this state.* My closest relative gets angry at the sight of the word "socialist." If I ever find a person here who will even discuss socialism you may be sure I will give him a sub to MR!

That may be the situation in Tennessee but we are happy to say it is definitely not the situation elsewhere in the country. We *know*, because the response to our request for subs has been the biggest in our history. In less than the one month since we announced our Special Offer, you sent in 472 new subs. That's an all-time high. And as we went to press with this issue, new subs were still pouring in, in spite of the fact that the Special Rate of $8 for 4 subs no longer applied. New gift subs are now $3, as always, and if you have not sent in yours, please do so right away.

If MR and its editors were as well known in the United States as they are in Japan, all of our problems would be solved. A few days ago we

(continued on inside back cover)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE STEEL STRIKE IN PERSPECTIVE

The great steel strike of 1959 began in the middle of July, was halted by a Taft-Hartley injunction early in November, and was finally settled only in January, 1960. Operating rates for the entire industry, having averaged close to 90 percent of capacity during the first half of the year, fell to around 12 percent during August, September, and October. For the whole year the industry operated at 63.3 percent of capacity, which was only a little better than the 60.6 percent recorded for the recession year of 1958. As a result of steel shortages, industrial production as a whole declined steadily from a peak of 155 (1947-49=100) in June to a low for the year of 148 in October.

It is thus clear that the steel strike was not only a major labor conflict but also had indirect effects of considerable importance on the national economy. The longer-run implications of the strike, however, are much less obvious, and it is with these that we shall be concerned in what follows. But first it should be noted, in passing, that most talk about the enormous cost of the strike is poppycock. To be sure, in a society capable of making full and continuous use of its resources, the loss of several months' steel production would represent a genuine cost of many billions of dollars. But American capitalism today never even comes close to making full use of its available resources, and a strike usually does not represent a net loss but simply an alternative form of less-than-capacity operation. It is true that steel production during 1959 would probably have been higher if there had been no strike, but it is also true that we would have entered 1960 with higher inventories and a lower operating rate than was actually the case. *There is no reason whatever to suppose that the total amount of steel produced during the two years* 1959-1960 *would have been a single ton greater if there had been no strike.* And as far as the steel companies are concerned, there are certain positive cost and tax advantages in shutting down entirely for, say, three months during the year rather than running at 75 percent of capacity for twelve months. This fact has to be kept in mind if one is to understand the motives and behavior of the steelmasters.

Let us now try to put the strike of 1959 in some sort of historical perspective. It occurred in a framework of labor relations in the steel industry which for the most part took shape during the 1950s. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reason why the strike took place at all was that the steelmasters decided that the time had come to force certain basic changes in this framework. The union on the other hand was well satisfied with the *status quo* and stoutly resisted this aggressive attack on it. The outcome is of course well known: the attack failed, and in all essentials the *status quo ante* was restored. A festive dinner party given by Vice President Nixon on January 11th symbolized the acceptance of this outcome by both sides. The guests included, on the industry side, Roger Blough (Chairman of U.S. Steel), A. B. Homer (President of Bethlehem), Thomas F. Patton (President of Republic), and R. Conrad Cooper of U.S. Steel who acted as chief industry negotiator during the strike; and on the union side, David McDonald and Arthur Goldberg, respectively President and General Counsel of the United Steelworkers. "The late bitterness over the steel dispute," reported Robert J. Donovan in the *New York Herald Tribune* the next day, "dissolved in expansive good fellowship tonight in the home of Vice President Nixon."

What lay behind the steelmasters' decision to attack? Why did the attack fail? And what are the implications of the *status quo* in steel for the future? In seeking answers to these questions, we must review certain facts and trends of the recent past.

The 1950s saw the emergence of a definite pattern of price and wage movements in the steel industry. In the summer, by the terms of a labor contract in force or at the time of the signing of a new one, wages and fringe benefits have gone up. Simultaneously, or shortly afterward, basic prices have been raised. Then some time during the following winter, when no one was looking as it were, "extras" have gone up too, further increasing the average realized price per ton of steel.*

The steel companies have of course justified this upward stair-step price pattern on the ground that increasing labor costs have forced them to raise prices. The statistical evidence, however, is overwhelmingly to the effect that they have in fact used rising wages as a recurring pretext for *more than compensating* price increases.

* "Extras" are additions to basic prices for products of nonstandard specifications, which actually constitute the great bulk of steel shipments. The best description of this wage-price pattern will be found in the 1958 report of the (Kefauver) Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Judiciary Committee, entitled *Administered Prices: Steel* (pursuant to S. Res. 57 as extended, 85th Cong., 1st Sess).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is an area where the old adage that "figures don't lie but liars do figure" is peculiarly applicable. The steelmasters and their kept economists are past masters at the art of statistical juggling and one must keep a sharp eye out to avoid being taken in. Probably their most telling argument is that employment costs per man hour (including not only wages but also premiums, fringe benefits, and social security payments) have been rising faster than prices. This is undoubtedly true, but it is also quite irrelevant. Prices are not paid for man hours but for tons of steel, and to get a meaningful comparison with prices one must take not employment costs per man hour but employment costs per unit of output, which in a dynamic technological context are two entirely different things. When we make *this* comparison, the conclusion is unequivocal. Between 1940 and the year ending June 30, 1959, basic steel prices rose 178 percent, while employment costs per unit of output rose only 153 percent. Moreover, *almost the whole gap between the two series opened up in the period after* 1954, *which is precisely the period when the present pattern of steel labor relations was taking firm shape.**

During this same period, as one would expect, the profitability of the steel industry increased spectacularly. This fact does not show up well in a simple time series showing annual profits or rates of profit in chronological order. The reason is that one of the crucial determinants of profits in any given year is the operating rate (measured as a percentage of capacity). As it happens, the operating rate declined every year from 1955 through 1958, thus obscuring the sharp increase in the industry's profitability at any *given* operating rate.

John Blair, chief economist for the Kefauver Committee, has analyzed the profits of U.S. Steel, taking account of the variability of operating rates.** He shows that from 1920 through 1954 (excluding war years), there was a very close and regular relationship: higher operating rates were regularly associated with higher profit rates, and any two years with the same operating rate also had approximately the same profit rate. After 1954, the relationship changed. There was still a positive correlation between the two rates, but now

* Data are from the background report compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and released to the press by Secretary of Labor Mitchell on August 14th (text in full in the *New York Times,* August 15, 1959).

** John Blair, "Administered Prices: A Phenomenon in Search of a Theory," American Economic Review, Supplement, May 1959, pp. 442-444.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the rate of profit associated with a given operating rate was about four percentage points higher than it would have been before 1955. More concretely, when the corporation—which we can safely assume is illustrative of the whole industry—was operating at 75 percent of capacity before 1955, it enjoyed an 8 percent rate of profit. From 1955 on, this jumped to 12 percent. If 75 percent of capacity can be considered to be about "normal" for the steel industry at the present time, then we can say that the profitability of the industry increased by no less than one half in the years after 1954.

One may judge from this how much justification there is for the steelmasters' pious protestations that they only raise prices when they are forced to do so by a prior rise in wages. The truth of the matter is that they have used wage increases as pretexts for raising their prices closer and closer to the theoretical monopoly price which maximizes their profits over the long run. As long as they were able to do this, they were very well satisfied with the existing pattern of labor relations and collective bargaining. A relatively large annual wage increase was actually *needed* to provide the cover under which a further move toward the monopoly price could be executed.

This analysis provides what may be a satisfactory explanation of the steelmasters' change of front toward the union in 1959. It is possible that they figured that in view of all circumstances (including the threat of competition from substitute materials and from foreign producers both in domestic and foreign markets), it would not pay to raise steel prices beyond the levels established in 1958. If so, a further wage increase, far from being an indirect source of additional profits, would for the first time in many years actually reduce the profitability of the industry. Under these circumstances, the steelmasters would naturally resist wage increases to the best of their ability and seek to improve profitability through increased efficiency, speed-up, and so on. This would explain the industry's conscience-smitten attitude about inflation—at the end of a decade in which steel prices rose more than three times as much as wholesale prices in general! It would also explain, or help to explain, why the issue of work-rules came to occupy such a central position in the struggle.

Let us now turn our attention to the union's role in all this. It certainly cannot be said to have been a glorious one, though it is admittedly hard to see how a union operating within the framework of monopoly capitalism could have behaved very differently. Wages in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the steel industry have traditionaly been relatively high, mainly because a large proportion of the labor force is in the skilled categories. But during the decade of the 1950s, steel labor made very substantial gains compared to workers in other manufacturing industries. According to BLS data, in 1949, industries employing 15 percent of the workers in manufacturing had average wages higher than steel workers. By 1954, this figure had declined to 9 percent, and by the beginning of 1959 it was down to 0.15 percent (by this time, among manufacturing employees only flat glass workers had higher wages than steel workers). If this relative improvement of the position of steel workers had come out of the profits of the steel industry it would certainly have to be regarded as a great achievement of the steel union, and indeed spokesmen for the union have often made precisely this claim.* Unfortunately, as we know from the above, this is very far from being the case. While with one hand the steel industry was paying better wages to its workers, with the other it was collecting from steel consumers much more than enough to cover the higher employment costs. What happened was thus not a transfer of money from the profits of the steel industry to the pockets of the steel workers, but rather a sharing between the industry and its workers of additional profits extracted from the consumers of steel. Moreover, it was only by sharing these additional profits with the steel workers that the industry was able to camouflage what would otherwise have been recognized as outrageous gouging and might well have led to some sort of remedial action even by a federal government as reactionary as the ones over which Mr. Eisenhower has presided during the 1950s.

It would have been utopian to expect the steel union to act differently from the way it did during this period. After all, it was doing very well for its members, and that is necessarily the first concern of a union. Nevertheless, it would be foolish to deny that objectively the union was helping the steelmasters to mulct the rest of the community. As long as this was possible, there was no reason for the union leadership to adopt a militant class attitude designed

* "We have the highest industrial wages in America, 25 to 35 cents per hour above even those of the automobile industry . . . When I totaled those figures I was amazed at the tremendous amount of money that has been taken from the profits of the industry and put into the pockets of the steelworkers, members of our Union." From the *Proceedings* of the Ninth Constitutional Convention of the United Steelworkers of America (1958), first day.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to redistribute income in favor of workers generally. Business unionism on the American model seeks immediate gains and pays no attention to the consequence for the rest of society, including the rest of the workers. It is an attitude which it is easy enough to understand under capitalism: why should workers or their leaders be any more public spirited than anyone else, especially since they would get the short end of the stick if they were to try it? But it is also an attitude which, so long as it persists, condemns organized labor to playing the role of junior partner in a Big Business-dominated society.

Has the strike brought about any change in this attitude? Almost certainly not. But there was a time during the strike when it seemed that this might happen, and this fact probably provides the key to the ultimate *political* settlement of the strike on terms which, in the immediate context, were unquestionably a defeat for the industry. In order to understand this aspect of the matter we must shift our angle of vision from the narrowly economic to the broadly political.

If our earlier hypothesis is correct, the steelmasters came to the conclusion many months before the strike began that they would lose rather than gain from a further round of wage and price increases. They unquestionably knew that with both productivity and the cost of living rising they would have to concede *some* wage increase, but they decided to keep it as low as possible and to concentrate their main fire on the work-rules issue. During the whole first half of 1959, they produced at close to capacity rates, filling up their own and their customers' inventories in preparation for the strike. By July, inventories were so high that a shutdown had become a sheer economic necessity. The steelmasters now felt that they were in the agreeable position of being able to kill two birds with one stone. Moreover, they undoubtedly believed that they could count for support on their friends in Congress and the administration, who had long been yowling about labor monopoly, corruption, and so on, and who had succeeded in pushing through a strongly anti-labor law in the previous session of Congress.

All in all, the steelmasters were sitting pretty at the outset of the strike. A couple of months' shutdown would work off excess inventories and at the same time undermine the position of the union leadership with the rank and file (managements always make the mistake of thinking that others are as money-minded as they themselves are). If necessary, the power of the federal government would be invoked to force a settlement on a reluctant union leadership. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

control of the union over work-rules would be broken, and the industry would have a free hand to reschedule work, reclassify or eliminate jobs, and the like. At a time when automation is rapidly changing the technological face of industry, this would be an enormous gain for the companies. What's more, other employers all over the country, no less interested than the steelmasters in curbing the power of labor, were egging them on and planning to follow in their footsteps if they should succeed. The steel strike was from the outset a real *class* struggle, and as things stood last summer it seemed—to us, among many others—that labor was in danger of suffering a crushing defeat.

Something went wrong—from the steelmasters' point of view. What was it? At bottom, there seems to be no doubt that it was the reaction of the rank and file of the steel union to the threat to their job security and working conditions. It was widely said at the time—and probably correctly—that the workers were not particularly enthusiastic about striking for a few more cents than they could have had without a strike. But when they realized that the companies meant business about getting rid of the union's power over work-rules, the attitude of the men quickly changed. They rallied to the support of their leadership, as did almost the entire labor movement outside the steel union. The steelmasters' hopes for a cheap victory soon faded, and with this the whole aspect of the strike gradually changed. Underlying class issues became more and more prominent and clearly defined, and the resistance of the workers to any concessions progressively stiffened.

This did not deter the steelmasters from the pursuit of their anti-union aims, obviously. But it did give pause to the more sober and intelligent politicians of the capitalist class. They could see that a policy of backing the steelmasters to the hilt, which undoubtedly would have meant forcing a settlement on a united, aroused, and unanimously hostile labor movement—that such a policy was full of dangers for the American ruling class. This is not the place to analyze the role of the alliance between Big Business and organized labor in post-World War II America: suffice it to say that it has been crucial to the maintenance of socio-political equilibrium, and that this underlying domestic equilibrium has been an absolutely necessary precondition for the kind of foreign policy which every administration and both political parties have assiduously pursued ever since the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The wiser heads of the American

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ruling class could now see that their own power of maneuver, both at home and abroad, was gravely menaced by the steel strike. To force a settlement on the union would be to unleash the forces of class war throughout the economy and to risk a fatal breach in the Big Business-labor alliance. No one could predict where this might lead, but to a perceptive member of the ruling class the prospect could not have been a cheerful one.

It was this situation which set the stage for the final denouement. It was now Mr. Nixon's turn to see an opportunity to kill two birds with one stone. First, as spokesman for the administration he could make clear to the steelmasters that they would not get the government backing without which they had no hope of winning against ever more determined worker opposition. This would leave them with no alternative to settling on terms which would amount to a restoration of the *status quo ante*—a modest wage increase, in line with increases in other industries negotiated during 1959, and no changes in the provisions dealing with work-rules. Such a settlement would end the growing threat to the Big Business-labor alliance, the importance of which is undoubtedly clear to the Vice President. Second, as a politician and his party's presidential candidate in the 1960 elections, Nixon could appear on the national stage as a friend of labor acting the part of industrial statesman. In seizing his opportunity Nixon showed to good advantage. It has long been obvious that he is a skilled politician: it now appears that he may have, in contrast to such industrial capitalists as Messrs. Blough, Homer, Patton, et al, an understanding of the real interests of the American ruling class.

What of the future? Does the restoration of the *status quo ante* in steel assure the continuing solidity of the Big Business-labor alliance with all that it implies for American society and America's position in the world?

No one can be sure of the answers to these questions, and it will be necessary to keep asking them and looking for answers for a long time to come.

As of the moment we are inclined to believe that the steel strike is no mere episode but rather the beginning of a period of intensified class conflict in the United States. There is reason to think that in recent years the process described above of sharing increased monopoly profits between big corporations and strong unions has not been confined to steel but rather has been quite general in the mon-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opolistically organized sectors of the economy.* Other groups in the economy have of course suffered (particularly unorganized workers and people living on fixed incomes), but these effects have been disguised and obscured by the general inflation of prices which in the final analysis can be traced to the monopolistic power of the big corporations.** All of this may now be changing. Owing in large part to the rapid increase of foreign competition, further increases in monopoly profits are harder and harder to come by, and as inflation continues, more and more people are beginning to see what is really happening and to take measures to protect themselves. It seems likely that from now on Big Business and organized labor, no longer able to collaborate at the expense of the third parties, will each try to improve its position at the expense of the other.

If this should happen, a great many things might change. First, *the existing unions, which comprise only a minority of the working* class, might wake up to the urgent need for a larger and more powerful movement. No serious attempt to organize the unorganized has been made in a long time, which is easily understandable if the argument set out above is valid. But the same argument leads us to expect that a genuine organizational campaign may be forthcoming. Nothing could do more to shake the country out of the moral and political stagnation into which it has fallen during these years of the American celebration (which is essentially the ideological aspect of the Big Business-organized labor alliance). Second, and of course closely related, the labor movement is likely to find itself being pushed more and more into politics. It is already quite clear that major struggles between monopolistic industry and huge unions cannot be settled by collective bargaining. They are power struggles, and power is the subject matter of politics. If we are right that such struggles are

* See the important article by Robert Ozanne of the University of Wisconsin, "Impact of Unions on Wage Levels and Income Distribution," *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* May 1959. There is unfortunately no comparable study of the *profitability* (not just the profits) of the big corporations.

** This conclusion is borne out, though for obvious reasons not in these terms, by a brilliant study made for the Joint Economic Committee: Charles L. Schultze, *Recent Inflation in the United States,* Study Paper No. 1, Materials prepared in connection with the Study of Employment, Growth, and Price Levels for consideration by the Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States, September, 1959. This study can be obtained from the Government Printing Office for 40 cents. It should be added, however, that people who are not familiar with the concepts and terminology of modern economics are likely to find it difficult reading.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

going to be increasingly numerous and bitter in the period ahead, it seems inevitable that labor is going to have to adopt a new posture. There is no space to go into this subject here: it is enough to point out that if labor once sets out in all seriousness to expand its political power, a lot of time-honored American institutions will be in danger —including the present pattern of political control in the South (hence also the present pattern of race relations in the South), and sooner or later the peculiar American party system, which is in reality a method of assuring political power to shifting coalitions of regional and local vested interests.

For two decades now, American society has been in a state of what the French call "immobilism." It has lasted so long, indeed, that many have come to believe that it must last for ever. This is of course far from the truth, and the steel strike may be the first sign that we are even now emerging into the light of a new day of labor militancy and social struggles.

(January 17, 1960)

What's Good For General Motors—Is Good For The Stockholder

If you had invested $1,000 in General Motors common stock back in 1908, your holdings today would be worth more than $1,000,000 and you would have received a total of $643,000 in dividends, according to a company spokesman.

UPI explained that you would have received only about ten shares for your original investment, but your holdings now would total 22,897 shares as the result of repeated stock splits.

New York Times, February 3, 1959

Fundamental objections to the operation of an industry by the government tend to disappear in direct ratio with profits.

—*Joseph B. Eastman*

I admire the serene assurance of those who have religious faith. It is wonderful to observe the calm confidence of a Christian with four aces.

—*Mark Twain*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ALTERNATIVES TO THE ARMS RACE

BY W. H. FERRY

The following is a letter which appeared in the January 13, 1960, issue of the *Santa Barbara News-Press* under the title "Alternatives to Arms Race —Drastic But Thinkable." W. H. Ferry, the writer of the letter, is Vice President of the Fund for the Republic which recently moved its headquarters from New York to Santa Barbara. We publish the letter as an example of a kind of inquiring and courageous thinking that has been all too rare in recent years among people in positions like Mr. Ferry's.—The Editors

Editor, News-Press: When one says that war is unthinkable, it must be taken as a literal statement, i.e., nuclear war cannot be thought about. We have no vocabulary, no recourse to imagination sufficient to deal in logical terms with the prospect of 60 or 70 million American corpses, to say nothing about the carnage accompanying a nuclear attack, and to say nothing of the effects of radiation lingering over generations.

Perhaps this is one reason why all current assessments of the impasse between Russia and the United States end up in the same sterile and hopeless formula: Arms and yet more arms.

In commenting on the reports of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and the Stanford and Johns Hopkins research groups your editorial (Jan. 8) comes to the same fruitless conclusion, that since we cannot think of anything else to do, let us continue with all speed to make bombs, gas, germs, rockets, missiles and submarines.

Suppose we were to go in the other direction? Suppose we were to junk all of our weapons of whatever kind? Suppose we were to tell the world that we are doing so because we are convinced that it is the only practical way out of the fateful dilemma in which all are caught?

The best possible result of such a decision is that it would give us the unquestioned moral leadership of an apprehensive world, that Russia would follow our example because of its declared eagerness to compete and surpass on grounds other than armed might, and that all could turn to the solution of humanity's pressing problems.

The worst possible result is that Russia would instantly take advantage of our defenselessness to bomb the U.S. into radioactive rubble. In this case we would not be worse off than if we had engaged in a two-way war. All that would be lacking would be a regret among

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

survivors that we had not had vengeance on our attackers. But this result seems wholly unlikely. It may better be supposed that Russia does not desire the extinction of the U.S. but its submission as a nation and great production center to Communism.

Another and more possible result then is that this country would be taken over by the Reds, commissars replacing our managers and mayors, legislators and union officials, broadcasters and publishers. (We may also presume similar action in those countries of Western Europe and elsewhere for which our arms are said to provide a shield.) This is a desperate and repellent vision; and while I do not believe that this would be the outcome, it is necessary to accept it as a possibility if one is willing to argue that unilateral disarmament is the only practical policy for this country to adopt. Red domination of this and other free nations is at least "thinkable." We can at least imagine it in all its hateful and dismal aspects, while we find the consequences of a nuclear, germ, and gas war unthinkable and unimaginable. We would survive as a nation with the greatest of traditions and with the unquenchable intention of demonstrating by argument and peacable resistance the power of freedom and justice as man's best and only proper organizing principles.

It might well take years or decades to regenerate freedom and justice. But we would have the chance to do so, a chance that by common agreement would not be vouchsafed us in the case of an all-out war which no nation could win. Should war come the task would not be resisting or throwing off the hand of an oppressor by reasonable means; it would be the task of rebuilding civilization from barbarism and chaos.

It is said that we are now following the only feasible road in seeking disarmament with iron-clad agreements on inspection. This is not the "middle road" it is claimed to be, for the preparations for war continue without let-up. This argument contains, moreover, fatal fallacies. Inspection cannot be devised that will give absolute assurance against manufacture or stockpiling of lethal weapons. Highly productive countries like the U.S. and Russia will always be able to maintain facilities for making such arms, convertible almost overnight from peacetime industry. An inspection system is institutionalized distrust, and as fragile as any understanding so based.

The alternatives are drastic and repugnant in the highest degree. But the important point is that there is an alternative to our present policy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CONFLICT WITHIN PSYCHOANALYSIS

BY N. S. LEHRMAN

This is one of four critical commentaries by professional psychoanalysts on Paul A. Baran's article "Marxism and Psychoanalysis" which appeared in the October, 1959, issue of MONTHLY REVIEW. They will be published, along with a rejoinder by Professor Baran, in an MR pamphlet which will be ready for distribution at a price of 50 cents a copy in the near future. If you send in your orders now you will receive the pamphlet as soon as it is off the press.—The Editors

Professor Baran's distinguished paper on "Marxism and Psychoanalysis" in the October issue of MONTHLY REVIEW, is a welcome advance in Marxist thinking. It points out the fundamental difference in approach between Freud and Marx, rather than prating about nonexistent differences between Freud and Pavlov. The basic truth which Baran points out most clearly once again is the fundamental fact that Marx's sociological explanations of psychology are far more accurate and far more useful than Freud's biopsychological explanations of sociology.

Having made this point, however, Baran does not slip and throw the Freudian baby out with the bathwater. He recognizes the importance, as many Marxists have not, of separating that which is true and useful in Freud's work from its mystical, unscientific core. To follow Baran still further, I think we must do with Freud what Marx did with the mystical Hegel: not discard him but, in a sense, stand him on his feet. I believe this task is in process of being accomplished.

The key to this problem, as I see it, is the scientific recognition and understanding of the importance of human feelings as *signals*. Pavlovians have recognized the importance of verbal signals, but have tended to minimize the significance of emotions. Freudians, correctly recognizing the importance of human feelings, have incorrectly seen them as determined ultimately by inner biological reality rather than by outer social reality. A correct synthesis of the two points of view is by no means impossible.

Dr. Lehrman, a psychoanalyst practicing in Great Neck, Long Island, is Clinical Instructor in Psychiatry at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Three Specific Criticisms

There are three aspects of Baran's paper, however, to which I believe valid exception can be taken.

(1) While I think he is correct in criticizing "socio-psychologism", it seems to me that he does not sufficiently recognize the correct direction this movement *has* taken, even though it has as yet not gone far enough. To present "socio-psychologism" solely as a "concession" is incorrectly to imply that there is a mastermind within the field of psychoanalysis from whom scientific advance is reluctantly extracted. I do not think there is any such mastermind, although perhaps some psychoanalyst members of the Guild of Catholic Psychiatrists might like to take on this function.

Because "mental health" has so far been presented only in terms of family and other soupy "togetherness" does not mean that the concept can go no further. True mental health can only be achieved under socialism, in which man's exploitation of man, and man's consequent inhumanity to man, have been ended.

(2) Baran's discussion of man's "alienation from himself" also has a rather vague and fuzzy flavor. I am not quite sure what he means—and this is unusual in so precise and meticulous a thinker as Baran. Perhaps he is referring to the ever-widening gap between the *actual* achievements of the individuals in our society and their ever-increasing potentials. If so, greater precision in his paper might have been in order.

(3) Baran seems to overstress the importance of spontaneity and emotionality in his basically correct criticism of the "men of measured merriment" of our times. This overstress can lead to a worship of impulse and feelings, at the expense of thought and consciousness. Freudians have attempted, in the most unscientific way possible, to separate thinking from feeling, and it is a little surprising to find Baran apparently tending to do the same. Thought and feeling are two aspects of the same process; Sir Charles Sherrington, the brilliant British Nobel laureate in neurophysiology, pointed out long ago that "every cognition has, potentially at least, an emotive value." This inextricability of thinking and feeling is most clearly described in V. J. McGill's fine little book, *Emotions and Reason.*

What Psychoanalysis Can Do

Unlike Baran, I write as a professional in the field of psychoanalysis. In my opinion, psychoanalysis is one of the most potent

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tools that have existed in the medico-ideological armamentarium. Provided that a person's basic economic needs are met—and they usually are in the people who can afford the treatment—psychoanalysis can often truly throw open the door of happiness and usefulness to suffering people. It can do so by giving them a clearer understanding of themselves in relationship to the world about them—to their families and to their society—by helping them to understand and to change their own incorrect responses. It can do so by helping people to understand their own feelings, the signals to their consciousness arising from their present and past experience, and by aiding them to understand the extent to which these feeling-signals are accurate, and to what extent they are not.

I have seen desperate, panicked people returned to usefulness, health, and courage through psychoanalytic treatment. I have seen disintegrating families, filled with acrimony, restored to warmth, happiness, and effectiveness through psychoanalytic treatment. I have seen cowardly people become courageous, and terrified people become calm, again through psychoanalytic treatment. Properly applied, by a courageous psychoanalyst with an accurate perception of the world in which he lives, psychoanalysis can, even at this moment, after certain important technical changes, be a most mighty boon to many of the suffering Americans who can afford it.

The effectiveness of psychoanalysis is, however, limited by the society within which it exists. The extent to which any person can be helped cannot, in the long run, extend beyond limits set by the contradictions and opportunities of the society he lives in. But, on the basis of what I have seen, I firmly believe that psychoanalysis *can* help people to see reality more clearly, so that they can help to improve the world, and even to enjoy it in the process.

What Psychoanalysis Has Done

The potentialities of psychoanalysis for assisting human advancement are tremendous. So are the potentialities of nuclear energy. In both cases, I am referring to what *might* be done with the valuable ideas, techniques, and ideology, after elimination of the anti-human and unscientific elements.

But the overall result of psychoanalysis, like that of nuclear energy, has been basically anti-human so far, it seems to me. It has had a profoundly destructive effect on human thinking, despite the assistance it has undoubtedly rendered to many individuals. Psycho-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

analysis is potent. It is potent in helping people to feel and function better, but it is also potent in making people worse.

The harmful therapeutic effect which psychoanalysis often has is frequently hidden by analysts' tendencies to blame the patient if he is more disturbed after treatment than before. "He must have been schizophrenic," they say, making a mystical, Kantian *Ding an sich* of this vague "disease."

But if psychoanalysts take credit for helping some of their patients, and they rightfully do, they must also take blame for harming others. In my own practice, for example, I find that the most difficult patients to treat are those who have failed with other therapists. In these situations, it is harder to undo the harm which the previous treatment has caused than it is to treat people who have not had the dubious benefits of such unsuccessful treatment.

Many private psychiatric hospitals have large numbers of patients who became worse in office psychoanalytic, or psychoanalytically oriented, treatment. The state hospitals know full well the glib excuses for uselessness and irrational behavior presented on admission by "graduates" of some of the psychoanalytically-oriented hospitals. These people are worse after treatment than before, so we must conclude the treatment harmed them.

The Pernicious Social and Political Effects of Psychoanalysis

From the social and political point of view, the overall results of psychoanalysis have been far more pernicious, I believe, than even Baran realizes. As often practiced, psychoanalysis is the most potent method yet devised for paralyzing the radical intellectual, and the Jewish radical in particular. Tensions, particularly of a racist kind, fill the air of our country, and vague, covert threats impinge on people these days, particularly when they begin to become politically active. The result is fear and anxiety.

There remains little political organization to provide solidarity and emotional support for such individuals. Indeed, many Left organizations seem so frightened that they tend to extrude the member who becomes uneasy. When in trouble, people no longer go to the rabbis and ministers for help and courage. Failing to realize that they are responding to the stimuli of a pervasively contradictory and threatening society, they consider themselves "disturbed" and seek psychoanalytic, or psychotherapeutic, help.

The analyst, "high in a tower up a chamber to the east," doubts

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the existence of harassment in the present, suspects the patient's reaction is "paranoid" and assumes that the roots of the fears of the present lie somewhere in the past. The patient accepts this concept and withdraws interest from the present in order to examine the past. Amorphously and sincerely, analyst and patient then go to work examining the latter's childhood.

The paralytic effectiveness of the treatment is maximized by the fact that both the patient and the analyst sincerely believe the treatment to be efficacious and scientific. This belief is enhanced by the fact that the treatment is sometimes accompanied by diminished discomfort, particularly if political activity, and consequent harassment, are discontinued.

And while the patient searches his past, the world goes on and opportunities are missed. I have often wondered what the role of the flourishing Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute was in 1932 and 1933, with particular reference to the paralysis of intellectuals of the Social Democratic Party.

The political effect of psychoanalysis has all too often been a substitution of procrastination for courage. "Contemporary moderns," psychoanalyst Allen Wheelis writes, "often put their backs to the couch, and in so doing may fail to put their shoulders to the wheel." This is the result, as Baran notes, of accepting a most changeable society as unchangeable, and leads to submission and conformity, rather than to change and creativity.

Search versus Dogma in Psychoanalysis

Within psychoanalysis, as in all other parts of ideology, a struggle is going on between scientific search and mystical dogma. Within the field itself, even today, increasing numbers of psychoanalysts are rejecting the biopsychological dogma of Freud. It does not work. Instead, they are searching out new and useful truths in the nature of the society.

While, as Baran points out, these psychologico-social trends still fall short of the truth, they do represent movement in a progressive direction within the field. They indicate a change toward increased recognition of the still basically unrecognized primacy of societal factors in molding our biological clay. It depends on Marxists, in the field and outside it, to point out that the essential "societal factor" which must be seen and changed is the existence of class contradictions within our society, contradictions which can be resolved *only*,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so far as I am concerned, by a peaceful transfer of power from the "elite" to the people, through extension of American political democracy into the economic field as well.

Search versus Dogma in Marxism

The struggle between search and dogma is not limited to psychoanalysis, however. It exists in the field of Marxism as well. Many previously accepted concepts may require correction and even—to use a dirty word—"revision." Science, after all, revises its conceptualizations when formerly useful ideas become a drag; isn't Marxism also a science?

One important area where Marxist thinking might warrant reexamination is its tendency to damn the entire bourgeoisie. Psychoanalysis, an important ideology of the bourgeoisie, reflects both its healthy and unhealthy trends. There is a tradition of political and scientific democracy deeply rooted in both the American bourgeoisie and American psychoanalysis. It was this democratic tradition *in the bourgeoisie itself* which drove back McCarthy, despite the signal absence of effective help from labor or the Left.

A fundamental conflict exists within the ideology of the American bourgeoisie. On the one hand, there is the tradition of freedom of peaceful dissent, which partly underlies America's previously unmatched technological progress, and from which emerged John Dewey's pragmatic philosophy. On the other hand, there is the fact of oligarchic economic control, with its ideological derivations of "elitism" and obscurantism. This conflict exists in the minds of every bourgeois, even those named Rockefeller and Stevenson.

Since there are such constructive, honest, democratic trends within bourgeois ideology, it appears that it might be worth while to work openly and honestly with the bourgeoisie. Such honest intellectual interaction is far more desirable than renouncing the constructive influence we can have on the bourgeoisie, and leaving the ideological field to Roman Catholic dogma and elite fascism.

Search versus Dogma in Religion

The struggle between scientific search and mysterious dogma exists in the much neglected and oft-maligned field of religion as well. The mainstreams of American Protestantism and Judaism today emphasize *search*—the search of each man for his own God, the attempt of each individual to realize his own potentialities. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

monolithic Roman Catholic Church, on the other hand, resembles much of the contemporary American psychoanalysis, insofar as both emphasize submission to dogma. The former kneels while the latter lies, each passively accepting what is presented as the doctrine of a great Jew.

Psychoanalysis, the ideology of the bourgeoisie, reflects both the scientific and dogmatic aspects of the class from which it comes. It, like the bourgeoisie, should be dealt with openly, peacefully, and scientifically, so as to retain that which is good and useful, without keeping the dead and dogmatic. Precision, rather than large emptiness, is the hallmark of science. Let us therefore be careful not to throw the baby out with the bath water—whether the baby be Freudian or bourgeois.

REFLECTIONS ON ALIENATION

BY ARTHUR K. DAVIS

In every historical epoch, a few master ideas are the key to understanding the age. These ideas describe the main social and economic processes, power groupings, and conflicts. The labels different writers put upon these large historical structures and processes may vary. But they are the essential realities to be grasped, by whatever terms, if the underlying drift of an age is to be distinguished from the confusing complexity of surface eddies.

What are the master ideas which help to explain our times?

For one, there is the idea of accelerating world industrialization, proceeding unevenly but inexorably—first in the West in a capitalistic form, and now in the East as socialism. Then there is the whole series of dilemmas inherent in capitalist economies: owners versus workers, the cycle of overproduction, the lopsided primacy of the private sector over the public sector, the trend toward monopolistic concentration of irresponsible wealth and power, the growing reliance upon large-scale waste, and above all the suicidal bent for total war. Each

---

Professor Davis is an American sociologist now at a Canadian University. His most recent contribution to MR was a review of C. Wright Mills's The Sociological Imagination *in the November* 1959 *issue.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of these dilemmas has several consequences. From the primacy of the private over the public sector, for example, stems in part the looming, many-sided crisis of the city.

Another among the master ideas of our time is that of Western imperialism leading indirectly to the successful Asian and African anti-imperialist revolutions. Surely no historical process is more central to our epoch than the worldwide transition from capitalism to socialism and the return of the leadership of social evolution from the West to the East.

These leading trends are everywhere modified, of course, by the particular geographic and social conditions of time and place.

There is no reason to look upon this list of leading ideas as complete. Indeed, one conspicuous omission is "alienation."

The problem of alienation has not had as much attention as some other aspects of the world crisis have received. But now we have Fritz Pappenheim's little book* dealing directly with just that subject. Most of the ideas we mentioned above refer to broad historical forces. What effects have these forces had upon individual character? That is the question to which this book is addressed.

By alienation we mean estrangement—the inability of individual men and women to relate themselves sympathetically and humanely to other people. A man who looks on other men simply as instrumental means to his own ends—who sees in other people only those limited traits which can serve his own purposes—that man is alienated. Thus estranged from others, he is estranged from himself. For man is a social animal. He is not born civilized. He develops his character, mental powers, language, capacities, habits—everything he learns—by means of social exchanges with others. His very conception of himself is largely a social product. Hence alienation from others is literally estrangement from self. "We relate only to those phases of reality which seem to promote the attainment of our objectives and we remain divorced from the rest of it," writes Pappenheim. "But the further we drive this separation, the deeper grows the rift within ourselves." (p. 13.)

The fact of alienation in modern Western societies is not new. Where Pappenheim differs from most other analysts of the problem is in his comprehensive approach. He finds evidence of alienation in many fields of human endeavour—in literature, philosophy, religion, economic life, politics. So widespread is the tendency, he says, that it

* *The Alienation of Modern Man,* by Fritz Pappenheim (MR Press, $4.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must be considered as one of the basic currents of our age. Even more, it must be inherent in the very nature of our social order. "Alienation is manifest in all the realms of modern life . . . its existence is not just the result of certain accidents of recent history but exemplifies one of the basic trends of our age." (p. 36.)

This is the theme of Pappenheim's book. That the great social ills of today are organically related to, and inherent in, our basic institutional order is a point of view which requires both insight and courage to maintain. It is hardly ever upheld by our professional academic social scientists, not even by those sociologists who specialize in the study of social problems. In fact, our "professional experts" on society and social problems are often less informed about their own field than are many laymen. Perhaps this is a measure of the alienation of our sociologists.

Pappenheim's book begins with a discussion of symptoms of alienation to be found in modern philosophy, poetry, and novels. Much of the appeal of existentialism, for example, lies in its anarchic revolt against the detachment of intellect from other aspects of life. The novels of Wolfe and Kafka portray the dilemmas of uprooted people. Arthur Miller's *Death of a Salesman* shows a businessman striving mightily for popularity and success, but attaining only isolation and frustration. The popular film, *Separate Tables*, was a study of alienation. Such works as these appeal widely because they express the essence of what we all experience in some form or other. The same insight is conveyed with great impact in the opening lines of Mills's *Sociological Imagination*: "Nowadays men often feel that their private lives are a series of traps. . . . They cannot cope with their personal troubles in such ways as to control the structural transformations that usually lie behind them."

Pappenheim considers next the argument that alienation is due to our machine technology. He concludes that the machine can be used for either creative or destructive purposes. In and of itself, a machine is ethically neutral. How it is used depends on the nature of the social organizations and purposes it serves.

Is there a relation between alienation and political institutions? Here the author can point to any number of outrages inflicted upon large groups of people by various governments during the last two or three decades. But were not these crimes committed to a large extent by fascist or Communist regimes? No doubt they were, especially

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

if we overlook Algeria, Kenya, South Africa, and a dozen or so other inconvenient "exceptions." Yet even in the United States, Pappenheim reminds us, it proved impossible to convince the combat troops of what they were fighting for in Korea. Their stock phrase was, "That's the way the ball bounces." Pappenheim feels that estrangement is manifested in political life but not caused by it.

Some readers may be moved to wonder why the Korean war couldn't be sold to the American army that fought it. Perhaps the official line that the defense of the United States required the massive napalm incineration of a backward peasant country on the other side of the world seemed a trifle far-fetched, even to our highly propagandized GIs. If so, we may view the aimless fatalism of the Korean veterans as a relatively constructive and positive reaction to a monstrous national policy. Pappenheim's treatment of this matter does not go deep enough.

The heart of Pappenheim's book is his chapter on "Social Structure and Alienation," which constitutes nearly one-third of the whole work. Owing much to Tönnies and Marx, this section suggests that the chief source of alienation is our economic and institutional order based on production for profit—based, that is to say, on capitalism. The author says very little about capitalism—he is never one to be blunt—but the upshot of his analysis is hardly mistakable. In a society based on specialization of labor, wherein most people must sell their skill for a cash return, labor necessarily becomes just another commodity. This is another way of saying that alienation is inherent in our economic order. The relationship between buyers and sellers of commodities (including labor) is essentially one of means and ends.

Here indeed is the basis of alienation. According to the dictionary, "to alienate" means (in one sense) "to sell." *Madison Avenue,* the citadel of advertising firms, is now as much of a symbol of American culture as *Wall Street* is.

"Labor can function as a commodity only when man's manual skills, his intellectual abilities and creative capacities—in a word, the human qualities on which work is based—become detached from his person. They must be treated in the same way as capital, as a fund which through good management and investment will yield value. . . . The workman who is subject to this fate can hardly be anything else but a commodity in human form, an individual not belonging to himself but alienated from himself." (p. 94.) This thesis, Pappenheim

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reminds us, was applied by Marx, not only to workers, but also to capitalists, artists, and professionals.

What can be done to combat alienation? Tönnies looked to producers' and consumers' cooperatives; Marx held that the socialization of the means of production would be necessary. Neither believed that these reforms would eliminate alienation—they would only reduce it to manageable limits. Pappenheim does not offer any detailed blueprints on this matter. He adheres in general to the position that a drastic reformation of our basic institutions is a necessary minimum. Otherwise "remedies will be found that do not come to grips with the forces of alienation, but merely heal some of the wounds which they inflict upon us." (p. 136.)

Whether there is an organic relationship between industrialism and alienation is a question the author does not discuss directly. However, it appears likely that such a tie does exist, since specialization, hierarchy, and large-scale organizations are probably indispensable components of any industrial order, either capitalist or socialist.

Under capitalism, alienation is magnified to the point where it destroys civilization—this it may do at any moment. Under mature socialism, alienation may be confined to non-lethal levels. During the transition from capitalism to socialism, a high but not necessarily fatal level of alienation is doubtless to be expected, if we may judge from the contemporary experience of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. That seems to be about all we can say about the matter now. Unquestionably this is one of the problems that needs our best thinking right away.

The Alienation of Modern Man would have been a better analytical work if it had dealt specifically with particular institutional orders in specific Western countries. Its method is to state various theories about alienation, reserving the author's views for the last. Some very abstruse ideas are restated in surprisingly simple language—which suggests that Pappenheim is not an ordinary social scientist. The tone of the book is one of quiet understatement.

But what a wealth of insights it opens up! Consider the immense number of contemporary events which are illuminated by the idea of alienation. Those phoney TV quiz shows, for instance, and the case of the Columbia University professor who blithely sold his integrity for a fat fee. That the professor was defended by various Congressmen, college students, and TV fans indicates how far the cancerous

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

growth of alienation has spread in the United States.

Another sign of the same malignant trend is *The Nation's* recent exposure of "The Shame of New York." Crime, juvenile delinquency, the "drift and thrust" toward war,the cynical frauds of advertising, the racism of the white supremacists, the hypocrisy of much organized religion, the boredom and the brainwashing that pass as education, the corruption of the medical profession by the "fee-for-service" system—these can all be viewed as symptoms of alienation.

Other examples are the apathy of voters in a supposedly democratic society, the indifference of the employed to the tragedy of the unemployed, the apathy of the American public toward the nuclear rearming of the Germans, and the lack of any widespread concern about radioactive fallout.

Alienation is indeed a master concept of our time. After reading Pappenheim's book and reflecting upon its implications, I am persuaded more than ever that the United States, about the time of World War I, passed a major turning point in its history, and began a long-run descent toward either stagnation or catastrophe. From this accelerating descent, still continuing, it may or may not escape.

I cannot close this review without especially recommending two of Pappenheim's points to everyone concerned with social problems. First is the declaration that such things as crime and mental illness need to be related to the basic constitution of society rather than to isolated special factors. Second is the rejection of the non-historical character of most contemporary work in sociology.

> Many [social studies] do not really enrich our understanding . . . they start by defining their subject in a very specialized way and concentrate on some detailed problem—the impact of . . . comic books and movies on juvenile delinquency . . . not even raising the question as to whether there might be a connection between the basic character of modern society and the present trend toward lawlessness. (pp. 53-54.)

> Most contemporary sociological work reveals a non-historical or even anti-historical, orientation. . . . We must redefine the relation between sociology and history. But do we meet this challenge by the radical separation of sociological and historical analysis which has become the prevailing procedure in sociology? (p. 63.)

If Fritz Pappenheim said nothing more than these two things, this would be a notable book. But he says a great deal more—and all

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in a scant 125 pages! (Plus, I should add, 22 pages of notes and 20 pages of very useful bibliography.) This is one of those rare books which offers basic truths, simply expressed, to the general reader, and striking insights to the advanced scholar.

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

From Summit to Summits

Semi-official announcements on December 22 and 23, 1959, informed the public that the four NATO powers, meeting in Paris, had made two decisions of far-reaching importance. First, there would be another meeting of the four Chiefs of State in Paris in late April, 1960, to which Premier Khrushchev would be invited. (This date was later shifted to May 15). Heading the agenda of this meeting would be disarmament, the German question, and the future of West-East relations. Second, following this summit meeting in Paris there would be other summit meetings in the capitals of other powers.

This statement marked a turning point in Western policy. It might even presage a softening of the West toward the demands of the East and play a decisive part in determining the course of world history.

One of the chief objections to a summit conference had been the impossibility of settling large, complex issues at a single meeting. The proposal for a series of summits, coming apparently from Great Britain, met this objection by proposing top-level meetings extending through months, if not years, at which urgent international issues could be discussed and perhaps decided.

We note in passing: (1) This would mean that world policy decisions would be made by spokesmen for the four leading Western powers, with Soviet participation. Soviet representatives would attend these meetings, not as a matter of right, but by invitation. The Big Five would consist of four equals and one guest. The West would

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hold the intitiative as well as the veto. (2) Germany once again had become the dominant Western continental power. French aspirations for greatness were being satisfield by having the first summit meetings in Paris. (3) The small-nation members of NATO and of the Association of American States would take no direct part in the proceedings, but would be consulted by the "senior partners" and would receive reports on the meetings after they had taken place. Asia and Africa would not be represented at all, except insofar as the Soviet Union spoke for them. (4) The United Nations, with its 78 non-summit members would receive reports, discuss and approve summit decisions, and carry out administrative detail. As a responsible world organization it would be pushed into a poor second place. In effect, as during the years from 1919 to 1939, the world would be administered from Central and Western Europe, with Washington footing a large share of the bills, and the Soviet Union observing and suggesting, but not really belonging.

We are not assuming that events will follow this planned course. Many a change will be made in the picture between this writing and next May. We are merely summarizing what seems to be the intention of the West in the face of the present world situation.

Before 1914, European mastery of the planet was widely accepted, though it was disputed by Washington and questioned by Tokyo. Between the wars, world power shifted back and forth uncertainly. Since 1945, Japan has slipped from near the summit of the power pyramid, and three new powers have entered the picture. The United States has bought its membership in the Big Five. The Soviet Union has crashed the gate. To date, People's China is excluded.

Through shrewd diplomacy and clever footwork, the British-German-French triumvirate, with the tireless cooperation and intervention of the Vatican, has re-established its position as the center of world diplomacy. This new power setup, while it lasts, dims the dream of an American Century. Dwellers on the chief planetary island (the Western Hemisphere), separated by four oceans from the planetary heartland (Eurasia-Africa), may have a share in making world policy. They will not be permitted to dominate world power relations.

The Cradle Will Rock

We must think of the world power balance emerging from the Paris decisions as unstable rather than stable, as temporary and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

insecure rather than permanent. The most obvious reason behind this assumption is the heavy dependence of the new power balance on a social order built around economic scarcity, private enterprise, a competitive armed struggle for ascendancy, and large-scale colonialism maintained by gunboat diplomacy. This social pattern gave Great Britain and Western Europe world mastery in the 19th century. Under 20th century conditions the program seems to be self-defeating.

The swift rise of automation spells an end to scarcity. Private enterprise functions locally, not on a world scale. A third period of general military conflict, using weapons developed chiefly since 1945, will result in ruin, perhaps in annihilation. Colonial peoples in Asia and Africa, using highly effective guerrilla tactics employed in China, Indo-China, Malaya, and North Africa, have made colonialism unprofitable and opened the way for widespread independence and self-determination.

Welfare-statism has possibilities. Economic and political federations like the British Commonwealth are playing a role in world affairs. But the structure of 19th-century capitalist imperialism has been so severely disrupted and shattered during the past four decades that it cannot provide a workable foundation for a European-controlled pattern of world domination. The program for world leadership, promulgated at Paris in mid-December, 1959, is built around realities which have been disappearing for several decades. Once again statesmen are trying to establish a world power balance which they might have set up fifteen years earlier, but which today is obsolete.

We are not surprised that President Eisenhower and his United States advisers accepted the Paris program for a world power balance. They are amateurs in power politics. We *are* surprised that the British-German-French-Vatican spokesmen proposed such a program. Leaders from these four powers have been through the mill. Have they learned so little during the last four war-torn, revolution-swept decades? Do they not yet realize that between 1945 and 1960 the world has entered a new age? Could not the architects of the Paris program of December, 1959, recognize the new realities and see far enough ahead to understand that their only hope of survival lay in ending the cold war, accepting coexistence in good faith, and inviting the Soviet Union and People's China into full membership in the World Directory? Could not the lesser powers bring their voices to the conference table and speak for their peoples? Could not

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the United Nations rise to world stature and, with world-wide membership, effectively handle world problems?

Instead of displaying such statesmanship, the Paris Conference proposed to organize a world power balance on the narrow geographical foundation of Western Europe and North America, with the Soviet Union as an invited but unwelcome outsider, with no other representation from East Europe-Asia-Africa. It is in this excluded region that the bulk of the planet's resources are located. It is there that the majority of the human family makes its home. Is it not clear to the shapers of Western policy that a program which ignores the distribution of the planet's natural resources and downgrades a majority of mankind will go on the rocks sooner rather than later?

NATO, composed of the same elements which propose to carry out the Paris program, has proved to be an inadequate, semi-paralyzed body, having the semblance of life and vigor only because it has never been called upon to perform any functions which really tested its vitality and strength. In the absence of United States subsidies and United States insistence, NATO would not have been born and, even if born, would not have survived its first feeble years. In December, 1959, NATO was torn by internal dissensions, with one of its major members, France, in open rebellion against fulfilling its NATO obligations. Can the forces which have failed to function in NATO provide more vitality when regrouped behind the program of Paris?

The Big Four, which met at Paris in December and decided on a summit conference in May, are the same powers that fought two fratricidal wars in one generation, that set up an impotent League of Nations and a powerless United Nations. It is the same oligarchy which developed capitalist imperialism and now proposes to regroup the surviving remnants of that system.

The cradle of this Big Four oligarchy is rocking, and will continue to rock, until the imperialist branch breaks and falls, dashing the cradle and its occupants on the rocks of present-day historical realities.

A New Cradle

Another item of major importance was overlooked by the Paris planners—the phenomenal, almost miraculous, advances made by the Soviet Union, People's China, and other organizers of a collective, cooperative socialist world. In the West generally, and in the United

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States particularly, information agencies have taken every opportunity to ignore or belittle the successes and magnify the failures of socialist construction. The result, even in the minds of well-read people, is a distorted picture of the socialist world as it stands today. The few thousand United States citizens who have seen the Soviet Union and a few hundred who have visited People's China have been astonished by the order, and developing industry, and the broadening culture which they found there. It is only on a basis of carefully nurtured ignorance and officially stimulated prejudice that the United States anti-Russian policy of 1919-1941 and the anti-China policy of 1949-1960 could have been inaugurated and maintained.

Only four decades have passed since the Russian Revolution of 1917 inaugurated a policy of building a socialist world that would first equal and then excel the world of capitalism. Two decades passed before other peoples began following the path that the Soviet Union was blazing. Planners and builders of the new socialist pattern faced the difficulties and obstacles confronting innovators in any field of human endeavor. In addition, the builders of socialism were assailed by a storm of ideological and political opposition, organized by the capitalist imperialists. Distortion, misrepresentation, denunciation, boycott, blockade, subsidies for disrupters, saboteurs, and insurrectionists, and large-scale military invasion were all employed in an anti-socialist drive to contain, undermine, starve out, and, if possible, destroy the new social pattern. The storm of protest which was raised against the republicans at the time of the American and French revolutions was mild and ineffective by comparison with the tidal wave of opposition directed against the collectivists after 1917.

Campaigns against republicanism failed in the 18th and 19th centuries because republicanism was the political front organized by the new business class in their efforts to break loose from feudal restrictions and bring the advantages of the industrial revolution to larger numbers of human beings. The business-class revolution established itself because it brought more benefits to more people than the previous system of feudalism had been able to provide.

Today, in the early stages of the power age, collectivists have a chance to replace the hit-and-miss of private business enterprise by a scientifically planned, efficient social order that will provide more advantages for more people than capitalist imperialism ever achieved. If socialist constructors succeed in this endeavor and demonstrate the capacity of their new society to bring peace, plenty, and well-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being, especially to the Asian-African victims of capitalist imperialism, they will be masters of the Eurasian heartland within a generation.

Western statesmen gained world supremacy in the 19th century. They tried to redivide world power in the years between 1905 and 1919. Their failure gave birth to the Russian revolution. They tried again from 1932 to 1945 to settle inter-imperial differences and to crush the revolutionary movements in Europe and Asia. Again they failed. This second failure led to the loss of vast colonial areas in Asia and Africa. With the December Paris agreements, the financial imperialists are preparing to launch a third attempt to rally their broken capitalist and imperialist forces and check the fires of revolution which are sweeping Asia and Africa. This third effort to stabilize and rejuvenate capitalism will fail as did its two predecessors. The failure will mark the end of capitalism as a determining force in world affairs. It will also open the way for socialist constructors to build a new cradle for the human race.

Presidential Example

President Lopez Mateos of Mexico was experimenting in December, 1959, with some practical steps that should commend themselves to other chiefs of state. The federal government of Mexico assumes responsibility for certain aspects of public life in the several Mexican states and in the Federal Department which houses the capital city. President Lopez, accompanied by officials responsible for federal administration and by representatives and senators from the areas under inspection, drove by car and trudged on foot through urban and rural enterprises which receive federal funds.

Reporters and photographers accompanied and followed the presidential party. Newspapers, magazines, and other information channels were filled with news and comment as to where the President went, what he saw, the questions he asked and the answers he got.

President Lopez was not out making speeches. He was checking up on the state of the nation. Top officers on a well-ordered ship make tours of inspection regularly. Top officials in other nations beside the United States of Mexico might well talk a little less about their respective nations, and as a matter of official routine, give them a periodical once-over.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS BOOKS

	List Price	Price with Sub
China Shakes The World Again, Bettelheim and others, paper	$1.00	$ 4.50
American Radicals, edited by Harvey Goldberg, paper	1.25	5.00
Man's Worldly Goods by Leo Huberman, paper	1.50	5.00
American Labor in Midpassage, edited by Bert Cochran	3.50	6.00
The Alienation of Modern Man by Fritz Pappenheim	4.00	7.00
Conviction, edited by Norman MacKenzie	4.00	7.00
World Without War by J. D. Bernal	5.00	7.00
The Wall Between by Anne Braden	5.00	7.00
The Present As History by Paul M. Sweezy	5.00	7.00
The Chinese Economy by Solomon Adler	5.00	7.00
The Political Economy of Growth by Paul A. Baran	5.00	7.00
Man's Worldly Goods by Leo Huberman, cloth	5.00	7.00
American Radicals, edited by Harvey Goldberg, cloth	5.00	7.00
A New Birth of Freedom? by Konni Zilliacus	5.00	7.00
The Theory of Capitalist Development by Paul M. Sweezy	6.00	8.00
The Great Road by Agnes Smedley	6.75	9.00
Caste, Class, & Race by Oliver C. Cox	7.50	10.00

Crossing The Line
by Claud Cockburn—prepublication price $2.25 List price $3.50

The Jazz Scene
by Francis Newton—prepublication price $2.75 List price $4.00

MR PRESS PAMPHLETS

Why Socialism? by Albert Einstein	15c per copy	7 for $1	40 for $5
On Segregation by Huberman and Sweezy	25c per copy	5 for $1	30 for $5
What You Should Know About Suez by Sweezy and Huberman	25c per copy	5 for $1	30 for $5
Marxian Socialism; and Power Elite or Ruling Class? by Sweezy	25c per copy	5 for $1	30 for $5
Marxism and Psychoanalysis by Baran Comments and Rejoinder	50c per copy	5 for $2	13 for $5
The ABC Of Socialism by Huberman and May	50c per copy	5 for $2	13 for $5

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Announcing a major publishing event!

KHRUSHCHEV IN AMERICA

The full texts of the speeches made by N. S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, on his tour of the United States, September 15-27, 1959. These speeches are translated from the authoritative collection entitled LIVE IN PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP! published and widely circulated in the Soviet Union.

Khrushchev's American speeches constitute an historical document of first-rate importance. They place before the reader Khrushchev the man, the political leader, the master of repartee and wit. They reflect the position of his government on a wide range of issues. But most important of all, these speeches are the principal record of a trip that has already exercised a profound influence on the course of world affairs.

Price: $2.45 232 pp. (please prepay single copy orders)

CROSSCURRENTS PRESS

33 WEST 42nd STREET, NEW YORK 36, N. Y.

(advertisement)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside front cover*)

received a letter from an American correspondent in Japan which said: "I have met many Japanese whose first question was, 'Do you know Leo Huberman?' You are indeed a famous American intellectual here." The very next day a friend came into the office with a brochure entitled *A Study in Contrasts,* a survey sponsored by Time International (a subsidiary of *Time* magazine) of the attitudes of American businessmen and opinion leaders toward Japan, and of their Japanese opposite numbers toward the United States. Our friend pointed out a table on p. 20 which we reproduce without comment: "When asked which American man and woman they would most like to meet, the Japanese businessmen and opinion leaders named a long list of Americans, the most popular of which appear below:

Man:	Percent of total
Dwight D. Eisenhower	13
Richard Nixon	7
Nelson Rockefeller	2
General MacArthur	1
Adlai Stevenson	1
Christian Herter	1
Prof. Paul M. Sweezy (Economist, Editor)	1
Walter P. Reuther	1
Cultural Professionals	1

"Intellectual's Radio" was the head on the enthusiastic account in *The New Yorker,* of the arrival in New York of the non-commercial FM radio station WBAI, sister of the now-famous KPFA in Berkeley, and KPFK in Los Angeles. If you are one of those intellectuals in the New York area who have clamored so long for a station without commercials—a station which would have its eye on good programming instead of on profits, a station which would run hours of the finest music and give dissenters a chance to air their views—know now that your dream has come true. But you must help keep that dream alive. Station WBAI is a non-profit listener-subscription radio and you and your friends are invited to subscribe. For details write to WBAI, 30 East 39th Street, New York 16, N.Y.

The Monthly Review program "If This Be Reason . . ." can be heard on KPFA on Sunday, Feb. 14, and every fourth Sunday thereafter; on WBAI on Friday, Feb. 19, at 7.30 P.M., and every fourth Friday thereafter (rebroadcast on Saturday mornings at 10.30 A.M.)

We are about to make our third venture into the paperback book field with a $1.25 edition of *American Radicals* edited by Professor Harvey Goldberg. The contents will be exactly the same as the cloth edition still selling for $5. If you don't already own this book, here is your chance to get a copy; and if you are a customer of a paperback bookstore or college bookstore please tell them about this MR Press paperback and our two others, *Man's Worldly Goods,* $1.50 (cloth $5), and *China Shakes The World Again,* $1.

We have already mentioned in these columns from time to time, two excellent English magazines, *Universities and Left Review,* and *The New Reasoner.* In December they amalgamated into *New Left Review,* "an independent bi-monthly of socialist humanism." We recommend it highly. You can subscribe by sending $4 to *New Left Review,* 7 Carlisle Street, London W.1.

We have just learned from the printer that *Crossing The Line* has been delayed until March. Sorry. Prepublication price of $2.25 will be in effect until then. Order now and we will send you your copy the moment it is ready.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

V PRISYADKU ANYONE?

DANCE, OF COURSE! If you can't, then learn on the GUARDIAN's trip of a lifetime, a 45-day tour of England, Sweden, Poland, France, Finland, Czechoslovakia and the U.S.S.R.! Peggy Middleton, charming London County Councilor, will conduct the tour, and the GUARDIAN's own Cedric Belfrage, Anne Bauer, Wilfred Burchett and George Wheeler will help make your stay in European capitals a memorable one.

Best of all you'll be traveling with **friends** who think and feel the way **you** do. A package price, no "hidden extras"—$1,795 covers everything. May 15 is the departure date, June 28 the return. For the complete itinerary and other details write the GUARDIAN.

WANTED:

Campus Representatives to Introduce the GUARDIAN

If you're on the campus you can "lead a tour" of the world every week by introducing the round-the-globe coverage of the GUARDIAN to your friends. The GUARDIAN is already an integral part of progressive student life. Socialist discussion groups, forums and other student organizations receive weekly bundles. At many schools the GUARDIAN has found its way into classrooms, and a growing number of students and teachers find it indispensable in developing and maintaining a perspective in these swiftly changing times.

For information on how you can become GUARDIAN Representative on your campus write the Circulation Dept.

NATIONAL GUARDIAN

the progressive newsweekly

James Aronson, editor • John T. McManus, general manager

197 E. 4th St. ($1 for 13 weeks — $5 a year) **New York 9, N. Y.**

(advertisement)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED